

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 are pending.

The Advisory Action indicates that the Amendment filed August 21, 2007, was not entered because (1) the amendments to the claims would require further consideration and/or search by the Examiner; *and* (2) because the amendments to the claims allegedly raise the issue of new matter.

With regard to point (1), Applicants have filed herewith an RCE that requests the Examiner to enter and consider the Amendment filed August 21, 2007.

With regard to point (2), in the “note” the Examiner takes the position that the recitation “said molded article having an impact strength higher than one having the same components which had not be surface treated with a coupling agent” is not supported in the originally filed specification. The Examiner is of the opinion that “there is support for ‘the resulting resin molded product enjoyed high impact strength’ when glass balloons are added on page 12, lines 1-4 of the specification.”

The originally filed specification discloses that a resin molded product made from a composition comprising a *surface-treated* hollow glass balloon has a high impact strength. A person having skill in the art would have understood that page 12, lines 1-4 *inherently* discloses that a surface-treated hollow balloon provides a higher impact strength than a *non-surface-treated* hollow balloon. As further support for this position, Applicants submit that evidence and arguments directed to advantages not disclosed in the specification cannot be disregarded. *In re Chu*, 66 F.3d 292, 298-99, 36 USPQ2d 1089, 1094-95 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

For example, the Examples section of the originally filed specification *expressly* supports the subject matter of amended claim 1 (specifically, a comparison of Applicants’ working Example 1-3 to Applicants’ Comparative Example 2-2). As can be seen in Table 1 at page 17,


working Example 1-3 has an impact strength of 13, while Comparative Example 2-2 has an impact strength of 10. The only difference between working Example 1-3 and Comparative Example 2-2 is that the hollow glass particle was subjected to a surface treatment in Example 1-3, while the hollow glass particle *was not subjected to a surface treatment* in Comparative Example 2-2.

Accordingly, the recitation "said molded article having an impact strength higher than one having the same components which had not been surface treated with a coupling agent" is fully supported in the original disclosure and is not, therefore, new matter.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Keiko K. Takagi
Registration No. 47,121

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 21, 2007